tuberculata and *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* refer to, and to change either of them would create confusion.

(4) Adrian Paterson

Ecology and Entomology Group, P.O. Box 84, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand

I use the name *Mystacina tuberculata* Gray, 1843 frequently, in teaching, research and publications. This bat is subject to a great deal of research in New Zealand due to its uniqueness and high conservation needs, and its scientific name is in constant usage. I strongly support the application.

(5) Peter D. Dwyer

Anthropology Program, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3010

I agree with the proposals to preserve the universal usage of the names *Mystacina tuberculata* Gray, 1843 and *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* (J.R. Forster, 1844). Spencer & Lee's discussion and recommendations reach beyond, but concur with, my own conclusions (Dwyer, 1960, pp. 10–12; 1962, pp. 2–3). Hutton's (1872) specific name *velutina* was an unnecessary replacement name for Gray's *Mystacina tuberculata*, and apart from Thomas (1905) and Mayer et al. (1999) has been used by nobody. I support Spencer & Lee's application in the interests of nomenclatural stability.

Additional references

Dwyer, P.D. 1960. *Studies on New Zealand Chiroptera.* Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.

Dwyer, P.D. 1962. Studies on the two New Zealand bats. *Zoology Publications from Victoria University of Wellington*, **28**: 1–28.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Holochilus* Brandt, 1835, *Proechimys* J.A. Allen, 1899 and *Trinomys* Thomas, 1921 (Mammalia, Rodentia) by the designation of *H. sciureus* Wagner, 1842 as the type species of *Holochilus*

(Case 3121; see BZN **56**: 255–261)

(1) Ulyses F.J. Pardiñas

Departamento Científico Paleontologia Vertebrados, Museo de La Plata, Paseo del Bosque s/n, 1900 La Plata, Argentina

After a careful study of the application I completely agree with the proposal to conserve the names *Holochilus* Brandt, 1835, *Proechimys* J.A. Allen, 1899 and *Trinomys* Thomas, 1921 for three genera of Neotropical rodents.

My concerns lie with *Holochilus* as I have worked with sigmodontines, particularly fossils but extant as well, for the last 10 years. This genus has a rich fossil record in southern South America, ranging from Middle Pleistocene to Holocene (see Pardiñas, 1999). The first citations (as *Holochilus multannus* Ameghino, 1889 and

H. vulpinus (Brants, 1827)) in the paleontological literature were by Florentino Ameghino in his (1889) classical work 'Contribución al Conocimiento de los Mamíferos Fósiles de la República Argentina'. Since then, numerous fossil remains have been described in Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, including an extinct species from the Pleistocene in Bolivia (see Steppan, 1996; para. 1 of the appplication). In this context, *Holochilus* remains are morphologically distinguishable with respect to the teeth, mandible and skull. A proof of this is the absence of synonyms — at generic level — from the paleontological record, in clear contrast to many other sigmodontines such as *Necromys* Ameghino, 1889, *Reithrodon* Fischer, 1814 or *Graomys* Waterhouse, 1837 (see Massoia & Pardiñas, 1993; Pardiñas, 1995).

The designation of *Holochilus sciureus* Wagner, 1842 as the type species of the genus *Holochilus* will be a good choice to conserve the stability of a strong and well known generic name.

I emphatically support the application made by Voss & Abramson.

Additional references

Massoia, E. & Pardiñas, U.F.J. 1993. El estado sistemático de algunos muroideos estudiados por Ameghino en 1889. Revalidación del género *Necromys* (Mammalia, Rodentia, Cricetidae). *Ameghiniana*, **30**(4): 407–418.

Pardiñas, U.F.J. 1995. Sobre las vicisitudes de los géneros *Bothriomys* Ameghino, 1889, *Euneomys* Coues, 1874 y *Graomys* Thomas, 1916 (Mammalia, Rodentia, Cricetidae). *Ameghiniana*, **32**(2): 173–180.

Pardiñas, U.F.J. 1999. Fossil murids: taxonomy, paleoecology, and paleoenvironments. *Quaternary of South America and Antarctic Peninsula*, **12**: 225–254.

(2) Marisol Aguilera

Universidad Simón Bolívar, Caracas, Venezuela

I write to support the application made by Robert S. Voss and Nataliya I. Abramson. I agree with keeping the name of *Holochilus* Brandt, 1835 for a genus of myomorphous neotropical marsh rats, and those of *Proechimys* J.A. Allen, 1899 and *Trinomys* Thomas, 1921 for hystricomorphous neotropical spiny rats.

(3) James L. Patton

Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley,
California 94720, U.S.A.

I write in strong support of the proposal by Robert S. Voss and Nataliya I. Abramson to conserve the present usage of the names *Holochilus* Brandt, 1835, *Proechimys* J.A. Allen, 1899 and *Trinomys* Thomas, 1921 by the designation of *H. sciureus* Wagner, 1842 as the type species of *Holochilus*.

As amply documented in the case presented, these names have been widely applied to individually well-recognized groups of rats in a very diverse literature, one that includes a vast array of ecological, genetic and epidemiological studies as well as systematic, phylogenetic and biogeographic analyses. As currently recognized, spiny rats of the genus *Proechimys* (sensu stricto) are among the most speciose and locally common members of the lowland moist forest communities of Amazonia north to

Central America, and *Trinomys* occupies the same position within the Mata Atlantica of coastal Brazil. *Holochilus* is widely distributed throughout the moist grasslands and forests of South America and is a major pest in many agricultural areas. While species boundaries in each taxon may still be insecure, and new species continue to be described, the generic assignments for each of these has not been in doubt for the last 80 years or longer.

The proposal in Case 3121 thus represents a simple solution that would maintain a stability in usage of long-standing and preserve the effective communication now present across a wide range of biological disciplines. I urge the Commission to accept this proposal.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Cervus gouazoubira* Fischer, 1814 (currently *Mazama gouazoubira*; Mammalia, Artiodactyla) as the correct original spelling

(Case 3018; see BZN **56**: 262–265)

(1) Robert S. Voss

Department of Mammalogy, American Museum of Natural History,
West 79th Street, New York, NY 10024, U.S.A.

I fully support A.L. Gardner's application to conserve the current spelling of the specific name of the brown brocket deer, which has almost universally been known as *Mazama gouazoubira* (Fischer, 1814) for many years.

As information retrieval from the scientific literature becomes increasingly dependent on computer searches, capricious spelling changes of taxon names are serious threats to effective communication among researchers. No purpose is served by reverting to Fischer's original spelling.

(2) Peter Grubb

35 Downhills Park Road, London N17 6PE, U.K.

I write to support Gardner's proposal that the name *Mazama gouazoubira* should be used for the brown brocket, even though the original name was *Cervus gouazoupira* Fischer, 1814.

It is appropriate to present some additional background information concerning this case. There has hitherto been a mood to establish or maintain the original spelling as the valid species-group name even when it has not been generally employed in the literature. Other examples occur in Wilson & Reeder (1993): *Neotragus pygmeus* (from *Capra pygmea* Linnaeus, 1758) replaced *N. pygmaeus*; and *Funisciurus pyrropus* (from *Sciurus pyrropus* F. Cuvier, 1833) replaced *F. pyrrhopus*. Further cases where the generally accepted spelling has recently been replaced by the original one are *Pudu pudu* (from *Capra puda* Molina, 1782; not *P. pudu*; see Hershkovitz, 1982, p. 60) and *Galagoides demidoff* (from *Galago demidoff* Fischer, 1806; not *G. demidovii*; see Jenkins, 1987, p. 98). Attempts to restore the 'incorrect' *Felis lybica* to *F. libyca* or *Naemorhedus* to *Nemorhaedus* (see Ellerman & Morrison-Scott, 1951, p. 304 and amendment sheet) have not proved wholly acceptable. I believed that I was following a trend (Grubb in Wilson & Reeder, 1993) by treating